

**SENATE—Monday, October 18, 1999**

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Dear Father, You created us with a family likeness, with a potential of emulating Your character. This week we celebrate "Character Counts Week." Thank You for the world leadership of this Senate in establishing this week in October to emphasize the six pillars of character so needed today: Trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship. Today we affirm how crucial are the character traits of trustworthiness, respect, and responsibility. We have learned from You what it means to be trustworthy. You are faithful, consistent, totally reliable, and absolutely true to Your promises.

God, we long to be people who are known for our integrity; that wonderful consistency between what we believe and what we do; that congruity of what we say and how we follow through. We also desire to be people who communicate respect and take responsibility for the natural world, for our Nation, and for the sacredness of the people around us. Each of us views Your particularized affirmation of our uniqueness. Help us to communicate that same respect for others. May this Senate be a shining example to America as men and women who are unreservedly trustworthy, respectful, and responsible in their leadership. Through them and all of us, strengthen the moral fiber of our Nation. In Your trustworthy name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Honorable PAT ROBERTS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

**SCHEDULE**

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 1 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1593, the cam-

paign finance reform bill. As a reminder to Members, two cloture motions were filed on the second pending amendment on Friday. Therefore, pursuant to rule XXII, those votes will occur on Tuesday, 1 hour after the Senate convenes, unless a consent agreement is reached to set those votes for a time certain. The majority leader has announced that the first vote today will occur at 5:30 p.m. It is hoped that the 5:30 vote, or votes, will be in relation to the amendments to the pending legislation. However, if votes regarding the campaign finance reform bill are not possible, the Senate will vote on any legislative or executive items available for action.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

**MORNING BUSINESS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business until the hour of 1 p.m. with the first 30 minutes under the control of the minority leader. After that time has expired, the last 30 minutes will be under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you very much.

**COMPLETING THE WORK OF THE SENATE**

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor this morning and talk a little bit about where we are in the Senate, at least in my view, and where we are going. We are, of course, nearing the end of this session. Nobody knows precisely or exactly when we will be out of here, but it won't be long. We have to take a strong look, in my view, at what we have to do, and the things that are necessary to do. There are, of course, certain things that are required.

At this time of year, Congress maybe hasn't finished its annual ritual, but the fact is we have done a great deal. I am pleased with that. But we must, of course, finish the appropriations. The continuing resolution expires this week, but hopefully we will have the appropriations to the President. We will see what happens from there.

In addition to that, of course, I am very hopeful that at least one other issue will be undertaken, and that is to do something about the balanced budget amendment and the Medicare restrictions that are in place.

You might recall that Congress asked for some reduction in the cost of Medicare over a period of time to ensure a firming up in the fact that these dollars are being used as they should be. Unfortunately, the administration has reduced that spending almost twice what was anticipated and, therefore, I think it will be necessary for us to go back and do some things for all of Medicare and particularly, I might say, for rural areas and small hospitals in areas such as in Wyoming.

I think we have allowed ourselves to become a little bit off track. We have gotten involved in lengthy discussions of issues that are probably not particularly timely nor, indeed, perhaps even particularly appropriate, issues that did not need to be or were not ready to be discussed and debated this year and could well have been put off until another year. But, nevertheless, they have been discussed, and we are, in fact, still involved in some of those—the nuclear test ban treaty of course, being one of them. Now we are on campaign finance.

There have been extended debates brought about by the insistence of Members on the floor. We have also had a number of filibusters and threatened filibusters from the other side of the aisle in order to control what was occurring on the floor.

I haven't been here as long as have many Members of the Senate, but I can tell you I don't think that in the time I have been here I have seen such a contentious and combative situation. It is the most controversial session I believe—perhaps the most uncooperative—in terms of coming to terms with the things we need to do.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, of course, have brought issues to the floor, and we have had a number of filibusters and threatened filibusters. I guess the most interesting was the latest nuclear test ban treaty debate in which there was an insistence that we come on the floor with it, and then there was a cry of

foul when it came up. That was a somewhat interesting and difficult issue.

We have had Members forcing issues to the floor that have had little or no support, but yet under the rules of the Senate they are entitled to be discussed and discussed for a length of time. In fact, we have had the feeling we are becoming too oriented toward accomplishing things. But, again, that is one point of view.

It seems to me we find the President now in the most political posture that I recall a President being in, criticizing the Senate for doing the things that we have a constitutional responsibility to do—treaties. We have the advise and consent responsibility on all treaties. That is in the Constitution. The same is true regarding nominees. That is our responsibility. I believe we have the right to do the things that we believe are right without being criticized.

At every opportunity, the President is calling everything a political vote. I find that paradoxical. There were allegations of racial voting on nominees for the Judiciary. I for one—and I know many others—did not even know the race of the person being voted upon.

The White House, trying to use many of these votes to breathe some life into a lame-duck President, makes it very difficult. We still have a responsibility. We have things to do. We have things to complete. We find ourselves in a confrontation, with the President threatening to disapprove appropriations. He has that right, as well. However, we ought to come together. We ought to talk about it. We ought to decide what we are going to do. We know we will fund the Government. We know we will go forward. I don't think anyone genuinely wants to shut down the Government. However, we are faced with that possibility. It worked out so well politically for the President a couple of years ago; he shut down the Government and we got the blame. I hope we don't use that technique again.

It is a fairly simple thing. It is very difficult, but we have a commitment to have a certain amount of spending—about \$592 billion worth of spending—outside the mandatory appropriations. We have to make agreements to stay within that commitment. We are dedicated to the idea of not spending more than that because we have to go into Social Security. As difficult as it may be, that is the goal. That is the bottom line. We simply have to make the adjustments that are necessary to do that. I think that is reasonable and certainly not impossible.

Aside from that, it seems to me we have had a good year. We started this year as the majority party saying we were committed to ensuring a sound Social Security retirement system. We said we were here to help improve educational opportunities for our children, to expand economic opportunities for all Americans, to provide a strength-

ening of our national security to protect our freedoms. Those were the four things we set about to do. I believe the leadership and the Members have called for that.

Despite all the talk and concern about education in the appropriations, the Republican proposal has \$537 million more than the President requested. We have passed a bill that increases flexibility and opportunity for the States, the local school boards, and the parents to make the necessary decisions in their school districts. The school districts in Basin, WY, have different needs than in Philadelphia, PA. To the extent the Federal Government has a role—which represents, by the way, about 7 percent of total educational spending; not a huge amount—that money should be able to be spent the way the people wish to spend it. They, after all, are responsible for the education of their children.

In our tax bill, which the President vetoed, there were several educational propositions, educational savings accounts, and student loan programs available, as well. Of course, the President vetoed those bills. We have done a great deal in education. I think it is something of which we should be proud.

Everyone talks about Social Security. It is one of our most important issues. Everyone who has worked for a wage or worked in their own business has paid into Social Security. Our commitment is to have Social Security available not only for those who are now beneficiaries but, indeed, for those young people who have just begun to work. There has been a great deal of discussion. The President talked about saving Social Security, but, frankly, has put nothing forward.

We have done a couple of things. One is to have a Social Security lockbox to ensure we will not spend the Social Security money, and that will be a test of this budget. The other is to propose that we have the kind of Social Security program so at least a portion of those funds can be put into an individual account that belongs to the person who has been putting in the money. It can be invested directly in equities in the private sector to increase the return. I am pleased with that.

We have increased military spending by about \$17 billion. It has gone down over the last several years despite the fact that the world is not safe.

Tax relief: We spent a great deal of time working on opportunities for all Americans to save some of the money they pay to taxes through marriage penalties, through estate tax reduction, capital gains reduction, and general reductions in rates. The President vetoed that because he wants to spend more money.

In health care, we have a Patients' Bill of Rights that I think is excellent. We also have committed ourselves to do something on the balanced budget.

These are the things on which we have made a great deal of progress. In addition, we recently had the test ban on nuclear testing. In a press conference last week, the President tried to deflect criticism about the lack of leadership he provided and the fact that not even a majority of this Senate supported it on a final vote by blaming it all on partisan politics, accusing the Republicans of making the world a more dangerous place.

Acting against the national interest? Nonsense. Let me give some canards. Neither the United States nor the Senate have changed their views on nuclear testing. I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and Japan. We are not going to start testing; we have not changed our position. We have no plan to test. Our policies in that regard are exactly the same as they were before the vote. All we were saying in the vote was, this is not the treaty at this time, with these shortcomings.

The President tried to blame the Republicans for being in a partisan mode. The President should look at his own party. Democrats demanded we have a vote on this treaty or they would filibuster all action on the Senate floor. On September 18, the Senator from North Dakota said:

I intend to plant myself on the floor like a potted plant and object. I intend to object to other routine business of the Senate until the majority leader brings this treaty to the floor for debate and vote. I don't run this place, but those who do should know this is going to be a rough place to run if you do not decide to bring this issue to a vote.

We brought it to a vote and apparently they got exactly what they demanded—a debate and vote. Before the President blames the Republicans, he ought to take a look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The vote was not a vote against national security. In an attempt to frighten people, the President accused those who opposed it of threatening the national security, that no thinking person could possibly oppose it.

Let me list for the Senate some of the people whom the President dismissed: Henry Kissinger, six former Secretaries of Defense, four former CIA Chiefs, former Federal weapons lab Directors, two former Chiefs of Staff, the President's own head of Strategic Command at the time the treaty was negotiated, three former National Security Advisers. It goes on and on.

This idea of isolationism is ridiculous. The idea of maintaining the U.S. military strength is not. That, in the view of many, gives the best opportunity for security.

Now we are involved, of course, in this question of campaign finance. It is a legitimate issue, a good issue. We have been into it before. We passed bills in the 1970s. We passed bills in the 1980s. It has not changed an awful lot. Some people suggest it has been blown completely out of hand. I suggest it is

probably not true. The expenditures in the average congressional district have gone up about 3.6 percent a year since 1986. That is hardly runaway. It amounts to about \$1 per voter in most congressional districts.

But I believe—and, for myself, I think there is some consensus in the Senate—it is an important issue. I have said, and I continue to say, I support some changes. I would like to see more disclosure. It seems to me that is the most important thing. If there is going to be money—and, indeed, there has to be money—if people are to understand the issues and have a chance to speak out, to have the freedom of speech, to have the opportunity to participate, it has to be open. But I think there should be disclosure. There should be disclosure right up until the end of the election, and we can do that. We should enforce the laws already on the books, as is the case with many other matters of enforcement. I think we have to protect the constitutional rights of individuals to participate.

I would support some limit on soft money. I do not know how, constitutionally, that would be accepted by the Supreme Court. Nevertheless, I would set some limit and support that. But I would not support doing away with it. I would not support eliminating it. I would not support the bill as it is proposed now.

We can contribute to the integrity of the process and help return more confidence to it. I have thought about this a lot. People who support Members, or people who are running, do so because of what they believe. They do not change their beliefs because they received some support. As you look around for whom you are going to support in the election, you support the person whose beliefs are similar to yours. I support things in my State—I suppose some people call them special interests—because they are important to my State. Those are the industries at which most people in my State work. Those are the kinds of industries that we need to have a vibrant economy. Of course I support those, not because of some contribution.

In summary, I wish we were in a little different situation in our relationship on both sides of this aisle and in our relationship with the White House, so we could really look at some issues, come out with what seems best to us as a group, and move forward.

On the other hand, I am very pleased with many of the things we have done. I can tell you, most people in my State, when we talk about doing all these things, have a limit in their minds as to what the Congress ought to be doing, what is the role of the Federal Government. It is not up to the Congress to solve every problem. On the contrary, we are better off to push more and more of that government closer to the people, where they can

make the decisions, not the one-size-fits-all kind of thing some people here would like to have.

We are ready to move on and finish up. I look forward to it. I hope we can conclude our work and do the best things for the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we continue morning business until the hour of 1:05. I think it ends at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

#### PARENTS' INFLUENCE IN YOUTHFUL DRUG USE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I greet my colleagues with the often bad news of drug use by young people, and particularly with reference to the very important role of parents in preventing youth drug use. As I do occasionally, in my capacity as chairman of the International Narcotics Control Caucus of the Senate, I come to the floor to report on national surveys that go on in this area, surveys that have been going on for a couple of decades, so we are able to compare the incidence of increasing drug experimentation by young people as well as following trends we had in the last decade in declines in drug use by young people.

I seek the floor today to visit with my colleagues on this very same subject, as I have many times in the past since I have been chairman of this group of our colleagues who spend a great deal of time on drug problems generally and, of course, a lot of time on the issue of drug use by young people.

So, again, as happens at the beginning of every school year, there are these national surveys that are made public. Within the last month or so, several of these have been made public. That is what I want to discuss with my colleagues. There have been three national surveys released that tell the story of drug use in the United States, particularly among teenagers.

On September 8 of this year, the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse—that is called CASA, for short. Let me say it again: It is a National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse. That organization released its annual back-to-school survey on the attitudes of teens and parents regarding substance abuse. The survey stressed how essential it is for parents to get involved in their children's lives. The survey indicates that kids actually

do listen to their parents. In fact, 42 percent of the teenagers who have never used marijuana credit their parents with that decision. Unfortunately, too many parents—45 percent—believe that teenagers' use of drugs is inevitable. In addition, 25 percent of the parents said they have little influence over their teen's substance abuse.

I suggest to that 25 percent that they ought to consider that 42 percent of the young people in America have already responded to this survey, saying they do not use marijuana because their parents have influenced them not to. And for the 25 percent of the parents who do not think they can have any influence over their teen's substance abuse, they would probably have considerable and beneficial influence.

CASA stresses how important parental involvement is. A child with a positive relationship with both parents is less likely to get involved with drugs. The survey also suggests that family-oriented activities such as eating dinners together and attending religious services together can reduce the risk of substance abuse.

The second week in September also marked the release of the annual Parents Resource Institute for Drug Education survey. That acronym is PRIDE, P-R-I-D-E. PRIDE's survey on teenage drug use. The survey also indicated the importance of parents' influence in shaping the attitude of teens regarding the harmful effects of drugs, just like the CASA survey.

Unfortunately, this past year the overall attitude among youth towards the harmful effects of drugs remains mostly unchanged. In fact, some attitudes worsened. Sadly, about 27 percent used an illegal drug at least once in the last year, and about 16 percent used drugs monthly or more often. Moreover, the number of students who regarded cocaine and heroin as harmful has decreased from the previous year. We know that, as perception of risk of use goes down, actual use of cocaine and heroin goes up. The monthly use of cocaine by high school students rose from 3.1 percent to 3.2 percent, hallucinogens went up from 3.9 percent to 4.2 percent, and liquor—and we don't often think enough of a legal product, liquor, being used illegally by young people as being a problem—but it went up from 26.9 percent to 28.1 percent. Worse yet, beer tends to be a gateway for uses of these other drugs that eventually leads, by some young people, to worse drugs. Unfortunately, in this PRIDE survey, the number of students who said drugs cause no harm increased over the previous year.

So that message out there that is strong and hard and definitive and constant that drug use is bad, does work but not if it isn't consistently heard and reinforced.

The PRIDE survey reiterates that parents have the power to change these